



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Citizens for Turner
Kevin Doering, Deputy Campaign Manager
120 W. 2nd Street
Dayton, OH 45402

MAY 24 2019

RE: MUR 7457
Theresa Gasper and Theresa Gasper for
Congress and Jennifer May in her official
capacity as treasurer

Dear Mr. Doering:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated August 2, 2018, and found that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, and information provided by the respondents, there is no reason to believe Theresa Gasper and Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a). Accordingly, on May 20, 2019, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Disclosure of Certain Documents in Enforcement and Other Matters, 81 Fed. Reg. 50,702 (Aug. 2, 2016). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's finding, is enclosed.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson
Acting General Counsel

BY: Mark Allen
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENTS: Theresa Gasper MUR 7457
Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May
in her official capacity as treasurer

I. INTRODUCTION

The Complaint alleges that congressional candidate Theresa Gasper and her campaign committee, Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer (the "Committee"), knowingly misrepresented in a campaign flyer that five universities endorsed her campaign, in violation of the ban on corporate contributions in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). As discussed below, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Respondents violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).¹

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Theresa Gasper was the 2018 Democratic nominee in Ohio's 10th Congressional District.² The Committee is the principal campaign committee for her 2018 campaign.³

The Complaint alleges that Gasper knowingly and intentionally misrepresented that her campaign was endorsed by five universities when it created and disseminated a fundraising flyer.⁴ The flyer advertised a "higher education fundraiser in support of" Gasper on July 12, 2018, and identified a "Host Committee," listing the five universities, followed by the names of

¹ The Complaint also alleges that actions taken by Respondents could jeopardize the tax-exempt status of the universities, an area of law not within the Commission's jurisdiction.

² See FEC Form 2, Amended Statement of Candidacy, Theresa Gasper (July 4, 2018).

³ See FEC Form 1, Amended Statement of Organization, Theresa Gasper for Congress (July 4, 2018).

⁴ Compl. at 1.

1 individuals.⁵ Each of the five universities are registered in Ohio as non-profit corporations⁶ that
2 cannot engage in political activity.⁷

3 The Complaint alleges that by falsely implying that the five universities had endorsed
4 Gasper's campaign, the Respondents knowingly caused the Committee to receive prohibited in-
5 kind contributions from each university.⁸ The Complaint alleges that at least one of the
6 universities issued a prior warning to the Respondents not to release the flyer, and that four of the
7 five universities ultimately repudiated the implied endorsement.⁹

8 In a joint response, Gasper and the Committee assert that the fourteen individuals on the
9 host committee were identified according to the school where they were employed for purposes
10 of brevity.¹⁰ Respondents assert the flyer was used for approximately 24 hours, and then was
11 replaced with a flyer that did not identify the universities, which Respondents provide in their
12 response.¹¹

13 III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

14 The Act and Commission regulations define "contribution" as "any gift, subscription,
15 loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of

⁵ Compl. at 7.

⁶ See Ohio Secretary of State Business Search, <https://businesssearch.sos.state.oh.us/> (search "University of Dayton," "Wright State University," "Sinclair Community College," "Antioch University," and "Central State University.")

⁷ See 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) (providing tax exemption to a corporation that, among other things, does not participate in or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office).

⁸ Compl. at 4-5.

⁹ *Id.* at 3. The Complaint alleges that such repudiation occurred, for example, by some of the universities issuing cease and desist letters. *Id.*

¹⁰ Joint Resp. at 2.

¹¹ *Id.* at 2, 5.

1 influencing any election for Federal office.”¹² “Anything of value” includes all in-kind
2 contributions, defined as the provision of any goods or services without charge or at a charge that
3 is less than the usual and normal charge for such goods or services.¹³

4 Corporations are prohibited from making contributions or expenditures to candidates and
5 their authorized committees.¹⁴ Nonetheless, corporations are permitted to endorse candidates for
6 office under the Act, as long as expenses for the endorsement are *de minimis* and the
7 endorsement is not coordinated with the candidate or the candidate’s authorized committee.¹⁵

8 The Committee’s fundraising flyer may have been intended to imply that the five
9 universities had endorsed Gasper’s campaign, but the record provides no indication that the
10 universities actually endorsed Gasper or that they coordinated with the Committee on the flyer so
11 that a prohibited, in-kind contribution could have occurred due to the implied endorsement in the
12 flyer.¹⁶ Further, the flyer circulated for only 24 hours, after which it was replaced with a new
13 flyer that did not identify the universities, suggesting that any potential value would have been *de*
14 *minimis*.

15 In light of these facts, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Theresa Gasper and
16 Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer violated
17 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).

¹² 52 U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i); 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(a); *see also* 52 U.S.C. § 30118(b)(2) (defining “contribution” to include “any direct or indirect payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or any services, or anything of value . . . to any candidate, campaign committee, or political party or organization, in connection with any election to any of the offices referred to in this section.”).

¹³ 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(d)(1).

¹⁴ 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a); 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(b).

¹⁵ *See* 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6). *See also* Advisory Op. 1997-16 (Oregon Natural Resources Council) at 4.

¹⁶ *See* 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6).